

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
US APPLICATION NO. 09/581,377  
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q80247

### REMARKS

#### Applicant's Statement of Substance of Interview

Applicants wish to express appreciation to Hai C. Pham for the courtesy of a personal interview which was granted to Applicant's representative Michael Faibisch (Reg. No. 48,427) at the USPTO on April 4, 2005. The Examiner's statement of the substance of the interview is set forth in the Interview Summary, numbered Paper No. 20050414. During the interview, Claim 1 was discussed vis-à-vis the Yoshida reference. In the interview, Applicants' representative pointed out that the Yoshida reference does not show or suggest a scanning beam comprised of a plurality of independently addressable sub-beams, wherein an unmodulated energy of said scanning beam has a generally Gaussian profile.

#### General Remarks

Claims 1 – 10, 13 – 38, 81 – 83, 102, 111 – 118, 120 – 128, and 130 – 139 are pending in the application. Claims 12, 119 and 129 are presently canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 is currently amended and claim and 136 – 139 are new claims .

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action in the present application. The present amendment is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed November 9, 2004, and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of all claims under consideration is respectfully requested.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

The allowance of claims 32 – 38, 81-83, 102 and 111, 113 – 117, 121 – 127 and 131 – 135 is acknowledged with appreciation.

Claims 8 – 10 and 14 – 31 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
US APPLICATION NO. 09/581,377  
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q80247

Each of claims 8 – 10 and 14 – 31 depend directly or ultimately from claim 1 which has been rewritten and is now believed to be allowable. Inasmuch as claim 1 is allowed, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection to claims 8 – 10 and 14 - 31.

Duplicate Claims Objection

Claims 118 and 128 stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 8 and 10 respectively.

Claim 118 depends from claim 116, and claim 8 depends from claim 1. Claim 1 is currently amended and now includes the recitation of “an unmodulated energy of said scanning beam having a generally Gaussian profile”, which recitation is absent from both of claims 116 and 118 respectively. In view of the foregoing, inasmuch as claim 1 is allowed, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection to claim 118.

Claim 128 depends from claim 126, and claim 10 depends from claim 1. Claim 1 is currently amended and now includes the recitation of “an unmodulated energy of said scanning beam having a generally Gaussian profile”, which recitation is absent from both of claims 126 and 128 respectively. In view of the foregoing, inasmuch as claim 1 is allowed, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection to claim 128.

Claims 119 – 120 and 129 – 130 stand objected to as being dependent upon objected duplicate claims, but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objection. Claims 119 and 129, each of which includes recitation similar to recitation that is now included in claim 1, are canceled. As noted above, claim 1 has been rewritten to include new recitation thereby distinguishing claim 1 from claims 118 and 128. Inasmuch as claims 118 and 128 are allowed, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection to claims 120 and 130.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1 – 7, 12 – 13 and 112 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Yoshida (U.S. 6,052,140).

Yoshida (U.S. 6,052,140) describes an image forming apparatus formed from a plurality of light emitting elements (LED chips).

Claim 1 has been rewritten and now includes, *inter alia*, the following distinguishing recitation:

providing a scanning beam comprised of a plurality of independently addressable sub-beams, an unmodulated energy of said scanning beam having a generally Gaussian profile;

scanning the surface with said scanning beam a plurality of times, said sub-beams scanning the surface side-by side in the cross-scan direction, each said sub-beam being modulated to reflect information to be written; and

overlapping the beams in successive scans in the cross scan direction such that all written areas of the surface are written on during at least two scans.

Nothing in Yoshida shows or suggests “providing a scanning beam comprised of a plurality of independently addressable sub-beams, an unmodulated energy of said scanning beam having a generally Gaussian profile”. Each beam in Yoshida, provided by a LED, may have a generally Gaussian profile, not a collection of beams.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection of claims 1 - 7, 12 - 13 and 112.

#### New Claims

Claim 136 is a new claim depending from claim 1, and includes recitation found in claim 1, prior to current amendment.

Claim 137 is a new independent claim, and includes recitation found in claim 1 (prior to current amendment) and claim 10. The substance of both of claims 1 and 10 is found, *inter alia*, in corresponding claims of in the originally filed application.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
US APPLICATION NO. 09/581,377  
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q80247

Claim 138 is a new independent claim, and includes recitation found in claim 1 (prior to current amendment) and claim 14. The substance of both of claims 1 and 14 is found in, *inter alia*, in corresponding claims of the originally filed application.

Claim 139 is a new independent claim, and includes recitation found in claim 1 (prior to current amendment) and claim 19. The substance of both of claims 1 and 19 is found, *inter alia*, in corresponding claims of the originally filed application.

Conclusion and Request for Interview

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

/Kelly G. Hyndman/  
Kelly G. Hyndman  
Registration No. 39,234

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 9, 2005